

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 27, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 13 and 28 are hereby amended. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 13, 16, 18, 28-30, 32, and 34-37 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13, 16, 28, 28-30, 32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended independent claims 13 and 28 and submit the rejection is overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13, 16, 18, 28-30, 32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moinpour et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,399, hereinafter “Moinpour”) in view of Fishkin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,658, hereinafter “Fishkin”) and Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,378, hereinafter “Hashimoto”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 13 is allowable at least in that claim 13 recites, inter alia, “fourth step, individually jetting deionized water that carries ultrasonic waves with a pair of jetting devices onto the two opposite side surfaces of the substrate, and wherein the jettings of the jetting devices are respectively performed to the two opposite side surfaces of the substrate that the brushings of the two opposite side surfaces are performed, after the brushings”.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 28. Claim 28 is allowable at least in that claim 28 recites, inter alia, “fourth step, individually spraying water that carries ultrasonic waves with a pair of spray devices onto the at least two opposite side surfaces of the substrate, and wherein the sprayings of the spray devices are respectively performed to the two opposite side surfaces of the substrate that the brushings of the two opposite side surfaces are performed, after the brushings”.

First, in the claimed invention, deionized water that carries ultraviolet wave is jetted or sprayed onto opposite side surfaces of substrate by using a pair of jetting devices or spray

devices. Thus, in the claimed invention, sticking particles or foreign substances on the opposite side surfaces are more completely removed by using the ultraviolet wave, as well as the jetting.

In contrast, water jet 35 of Moinpour is used to jet water into or near a contact point between leaves 208 and wafer edge 203. And, edge nozzle 35 of Fishkin is used to spray liquid jet 45 in edge E of wafer W. Thus, Moinpour and Fishkin fail to disclose the ultraviolet wave of the claimed invention. Therefore, Moinpour and Fishkin cannot obtain the technical effect of the claimed invention.

Second, in the claimed invention, jettings or sprays are performed onto opposite side surfaces that the brushings are performed after the brushings. Thus, according to the claimed invention, sticking particles or foreign substances that are not removed by the brushings are completely removed by jetting or sprays.

On the contrary, Moinpour and Fishkin fails to disclose brushings performed onto side surfaces. In other words, Moinpour and Fishkin disclose only jetting. Thus, Moinpour and Fishkin fail to disclose jettings or sprays performed onto opposite side surfaces that the brushings are performed, after the brushings are performed. Therefore, Moinpour and Fishkin cannot obtain technical effect of the claimed invention.

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teach or suggest the combined recited features of the claimed invention. In addition, the claimed invention has a remarkable effect that cannot be obtained or reached by the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, and 28 and claims 16, 18, 29-30, 32, and 34-37, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

**Application No. 10/647,475**  
**Amendment dated August 26, 2009**  
**Response to Office Action dated May 27, 2009**

**Docket No. 8733.311.10**

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant